

induced birefringence property. Applicants further submit that Ono cannot properly be combined with these references because Ono is not available as citable prior art against the present application.

Claims 1, 2 and 7 are drawn to optical storage media on which information is multiplexingly stored in the form of at least one light intensity hologram and at least one polarization hologram. Applicants define these holograms in claim 1 as "the at least one light intensity hologram being generated by a signal beam and a reference beam with a polarization direction of the signal beam in parallel with a polarization direction of the reference beam, and the at least one polarization hologram produced by the signal beam and the reference beam with the polarization direction of the signal beam perpendicular to the polarization direction of the reference beam."

It is respectfully submitted that JP-A 03-075789 does not disclose using a polarization spatial light-modulating element as elements 32 and 29' in figure 7 to store at least one light intensity hologram and at least one polarization hologram as claimed in claims 1, 2 and 7 of this application. It is clear from the translation of the reference, provided by the Patent Office, that only one polarization state reaches lens 26 and is written on the recording medium. See JP-A 03-075789, page 19, lines 10-16. The reference discloses the recording of a single polarization hologram (see, e.g., JP-A 03-075789, page 10, lines 6-14) or parallel images corresponding to the three primary colors (see, e.g., JP-A 03-075789, page 14 line 1- page 17, line 1). JP-A 03-075789 nowhere describes using a polarization spacial light-modulating element to store at least one light intensity hologram and at least one polarization hologram as claimed in claims 1, 2 and 7.

In addition, JP-A 03-075789 does not teach or suggest an optical storage medium comprising a polarization-sensitive member having a photo-induced birefringence property.

Thus, JP-A 03-075789 alone does not render claims 1, 2 and 7 obvious. Further, JP-A 03-149660 does not remedy the shortcomings of JP-A 03-075789.

The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the process of JP-A 03-075789 to record images using a polarization spatial light-modulating element as taught by JP-A 03-149660. Applicants respectfully disagree.

JP-A 03-149660 discloses retrieving data stored by holographic means in an optical memory. The present application is directed to different subject matter than JP-A 03-149660, i.e., to optical storage media as opposed to data retrieval. The methods of retrieving data taught by JP-A 03-149660 do not disclose or suggest the optical storage media on which data is stored in the form of at least one light intensity hologram and at least one polarization hologram and on which a polarization spatial light-modulating element is used to form light intensity holograms, by having signal beam polarization parallel to the polarization of the reference beam, and polarization holograms, by having signal beam polarization perpendicular to the polarization of the reference beam. Therefore, JP-A 03-149660 does not remedy the shortcomings of JP-A 03-075789.

In addition, the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 7 over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660 and Ono is improper because Applicants' priority date precedes the publication date of Ono. Ono was published on October 14, 1997. However, the instant application claims priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 09/056,798, filed on April 8, 1998, and both the instant application and its parent application claim priority to Japanese Patent Application 10-032834, filed February 16, 1998. An accurate English-language translation of this priority application is submitted herewith. As the instant claims are fully supported by the priority document, Ono is not prior art to the instant application, and the rejection must be withdrawn.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 7 are patentable over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660 and Ono. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Claims 1, 2 and 4

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and T. Todorov, et al., Polarization Holography.2: Polarization Holographic Gratings In Photoanisotropic Materials With And Without Intrinsic Birefringence, 23(24) Applied Optics, 4588 (1984) ("Todorov"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, does not render the invention of claims 1, 2 and 4 obvious, and Ono is not available as prior art. Todorov does not remedy the shortcomings of these references.

Todorov teaches polarization holographic gratings in photoanisotropic materials with and without intrinsic birefringence. Todorov does not teach or suggest the use of a polarization-sensitive member having a photo-induced birefringence. Thus, Todorov does not teach or suggest the optical recording media of claims 1, 2 and 4. Todorov does not provide the impetus to combine this reference with JP-A 03-075789 and JP-A 03-149660.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1, 2 and 4 are patentable over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and Todorov. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and U.S. Patent 5,384,221 to Savant et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 2 and 7, it is respectfully submitted that JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, does not render the invention of claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 obvious, and Ono is not available as prior art. Savant does not remedy the shortcomings of these references.

When two reference beams of orthogonal polarization and two object beams of orthogonal polarization are used to simultaneously record holograms, four holograms are formed, as all the beams are able to interfere, although two interfere in the light intensity regime and two interfere only in the polarization regime. The Examiner acknowledged during the October 21, 2002 interview that the same beam is not used in forming the holograms, as disclosed in the references of record. Therefore, Savant does not teach or suggest that the at least one light intensity hologram and the at least one polarization hologram are produced by a same reference beam and a signal beam that is polarization modulated by a spatial light modulator to simultaneously record the at least one light intensity hologram and the at least one polarization hologram as gratings, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Savant does not remedy the shortcomings of JP-A 03-075789 and JP-A 03-149660.

Savant also does not teach or suggest the use of a polarization-sensitive member having a photo-induced birefringence. Thus, Savant does not teach or suggest the optical recording media recited in claims 1, 2, 4 and 7. Further, Savant does not provide the impetus to combine this reference with JP-A 03-075789 and JP-A 03-149660.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 are patentable over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and Savant. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

D. Claims 1-3, 5 and 7

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and U.S. Patent 5,173,381 to Natansohn et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 2 and 7, JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660 does not render the invention of claims 1-3, 5 and 7 obvious, and Ono is not available as prior art. Natansohn does not remedy the shortcomings of these references.

As discussed above, the Examiner has acknowledged that the same beam is not used in forming the holograms, as disclosed in the references of record. Therefore, Natansohn does not teach or suggest that the at least one light intensity hologram and the at least one polarization hologram are produced by a same reference beam and a signal beam that is polarization modulated by a spatial light modulator to simultaneously record the at least one light intensity hologram and the at least one polarization hologram as gratings, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Natansohn does not remedy the shortcomings of JP-A 03-075789 and JP-A 03-149660.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5 and 7 are patentable over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and Natansohn. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

E. Claims 1-3 and 6-7

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and U.S. Patent 5,024,784 to Eich et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 2 and 7, JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, does not render the invention of claims 1-3 and

6-7 obvious, and Ono is not available as prior art. Eich does not remedy the shortcomings of these references.

As discussed above, the Examiner has acknowledged that the same beam is not used in forming the holograms, as disclosed in the references of record. Therefore, Eich does not teach or suggest that the at least one light intensity hologram and the at least one polarization hologram are produced by a same reference beam and a signal beam that is polarization modulated by a spatial light modulator to simultaneously record the at least one light intensity hologram and the at least one polarization hologram as gratings, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Eich does not remedy the shortcomings of JP-A 03-075789 and JP-A 03-149660.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 6-7 are patentable over JP-A 03-075789, in view of JP-A 03-149660, Ono and Eich. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Double Patenting Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-7 are rejected for alleged double patenting over claims 1-47 of U.S. Patent 6,452,890. Applicants respectfully submit that the attached Terminal Disclaimer obviates this rejection and accordingly request that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Julie M. Seaman
Registration No. 51,156

JAO:JMS/jms

Attachments:

Translation of JP-A 10-032834
Terminal Disclaimer

Date: October 20, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
